The Times-Dispatch
DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....916 E. Main Street
Manchester Bureau.....1102 Hull Street
Petersburg Bureau...109 N. Sycamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau.....215 Eighth Street

BY MAIL. POSTAGE PAID.	One Year.	Six Mos.	Three Mos.	One Mo
Daily with Sunday	$6.00	$3.00	$1.50	.55
Daily without Sunday	4.00	2.00	1.00	.35
Sunday edition only	2.00	1.00	.50	.25
Weekly (Wednesday)	1.00	.50	.25	...

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs), Manchester and Petersburg—

	One Week
Daily with Sunday	14 cents
Daily without Sunday	10 cents
Sunday only	5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1910.

WHAT OFFICE-GETTING COSTS.

Senator Culberson has been renominated for United States Senator from Texas. His campaign expenses footed up all of $27. He is a high man, with a good record, and his re-election is assured.

There is a most refreshing contrast between his campaign expenses and the campaign expenses of the Hon. Joseph C. Sibley, of Pennsylvania, who has just defeated his successor, Representative Wheeler, for the Republican nomination in the Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania District, at an expenditure of $40,000. A correspondent of the New York Evening Post, of a statistical turn of mind, has figured it out that the most Sibley can expect from the office in the way of salary and perquisites will be $18,500, that if he shall be elected he will have to wait for more than a year before he can take his seat, and will have to live in Washington for two years without anything coming in for living expenses. It is estimated that he paid $4 a vote for his renomination; but he says that he wants to go back to Congress, that he has the money to afford it, and that if he care to spend his money in this way it is nobody's business. It is hoped that the news that he is ready to "put up" will get generally "norated around" in the Twenty-eighth District—a nomination in Pennsylvania is not equivalent to an election as it is in Texas—and there ought to be some rich pickings for the voters at the general election. If Sibley want to spend his money, his constituents ought to help him all they can.

It cost A. Mitchell Palmer, a Democrat, $3,888.78 to beat Broadhead, who spent $6,628.44 in the Twenty-sixth District. Dalzell's nomination cost $10,000, and all along the line in Pennsylvania running for office is a very expensive thing. It is not to be wondered at that Pennsylvania is represented so poorly at Washington. The man with the "spondulix" is the man who wins nominations and carries elections.

Things are not quite so bad down South; but the cost of running campaigns, the expense of literature, and watchers, and strikers, and heelers, make it impossible for many of the most worthy and best-fitted men ever to aspire to public office. All this results from the overloading of the country with party machinery. Men are not chosen now because of their superior qualifications for public service, but for the facility with which they can play the demagogue, or for the money they are willing to risk on the result. Not only ought there to be the fullest publicity as to campaign expenses, but these expenses should be paid out of the public treasury. That would give the man with nothing an equal chance with the man who has it all, and would put an end to the present waste and corruption in short order.

NOT SO BAD AFTER ALL.

Secretary MacVeagh, of the Treasury Department, opened a new set of books yesterday and closed his accounts for the fiscal year 1909-10. The task was not an easy one, for Congress was prodigal in its appropriations during 1909, and the accounts were numerous, but with only a few thousand dollars outstanding, the Secretary is much pleased with the showing. At the very worst time, he says, it is not very bad after all.

With its usual facility for juggling figures, the Treasury Department argues that the deficit for the fiscal year was a trifle of only $2,800,000, as compared with $63,700,000 last year. The apparent deficit is $38,000,000, but of this sum the Government credits $34,000,000 to the Panama Canal, leaving only some $4,000,000 on all other accounts. As the Treasury might have issued bonds for the Panama expenditures it considers this account should be charged off, and it is not inclined to take into account $8,000,000 received on the corporations tax, when making its comparisons with last year.

Sweeping aside all this needless arithmetic, and starting with the bald fact that the Government spent $28,000,000 more than it received from all sources, the record for 1909-10 may not be as bad as that of 1908-09, but it is enough to make conservative men scratch their heads and wonder where the thing is going to stop. Before the war, the whole debt of the Government did not amount to $38,000,000; and twenty years ago, such a deficit would have appalled our legislators; yet Congress takes it as a matter of course, spends money in the same liberal fashion and the Secretary of the Treasury thanks Heaven the debt is not $63,000,000.

Even if the books of the Government had balanced to a cent when Mr. MacVeagh's clerks closed them Wednesday, there would be little cause for congratulation in the country. The economy of a Government is not measured by its balance sheet, but by its total expenditures, and where the latter are unreasonable, there is even less consolation for the taxpayers than there is for a man who is grateful that he has no debts when he has spent his last dollar.

A CAMPAIGN OF REVENGE.

The Macon Telegraph says that the people of Georgia are prospering, and that they demand peace. It charges that "the ambition for revenge on the part of one man has created hostile camps in our State," and declares that "one thing now only remains for the people to do, and that is to rebuke the disturbers." That is exactly what they ought to do. Why should they be drawn into a political quarrel for the personal benefit of a disappointed office-seeker already repudiated by them in a most pronounced way? The prime issue in the campaign, it is said, is the right of the farmer to the same registration privilege as that provided for the man who lives in town, and the other issues upon which the defeat of the present Governor is asked are his acceptance and support of the State Democratic platform upon which he was elected two years ago. "The challenge to Brown," says the Telegraph, "is a challenge of the Democratic platform—the Democratic party."

We are not directly interested in this contest; but if we lived in Georgia we should rejoice at the opportunity of making the meaning of the people of that State so plain that the disturber would never kick again. The right way to kill a disturber of the rights and interests of a State is to kill him dead by burying him under such an avalanche of ballots that he could never be digged out again forevermore.

NO TIME FOR HUGGING.

The spectacle must indeed have been thrilling in its intensity: Two great men weighing approximately five hundred pounds and both possessing doubtless many layers of hidden fat and likewise quantities of protoplasm—locked in a more or less affectionate embrace, as reported in the newspapers, lasting all of one minute, and with the mercury fairly melting in the tube at a temperature of something like 88 degrees. It is not often that such incidents are noted, because there are very few occasions when they occur and the fewest number of grown men who would think of enjoying themselves in the month of July with the huggee of the same general type as the hugger. The only other event anything like this that we can think of just now took place in the Senate-house at Rome, when a man by the name of Decimus Junius Brutus established his place in profane history forever. To this day some of the guides point out to inquisitive strangers in the ancient Forum the rostrum from which Antony delivered his funeral oration, which has come down to this day as one of the masterpieces of elegiac eloquence. We are not saying that there were any daggers anywhere around at the meeting the other day; but in times of excessive emotion the prudent man should keep a careful guard over his fifth rib. The Melican man has not been noted for his self-restraint on occasions when his emotions have been stirred, and, if Mr. Taft will believe us, he is better at the jolly than the hug.

LIVELY VOTING AT LUMBERTON.

There was a primary election in North Carolina last week and it was as fairly conducted, doubtless, as any election held in this country; but the manner of its management in Lumberton was made the subject of animadversion by one of the ministers of that town in his Sunday morning discourse. We have not seen the full text of his sermon, nor are we familiar with the tricks to which resort may have been had in the election, but we are told by the Charlotte Evening Chronicle that one of the most serious charges made by the minister was that "a Democratic primary, held in this town the afternoon before, composed of 243 people, cast 315 votes." This is not a very clear statement. If the total population of Lumberton is only 243, and we allow one voter to each five persons, it must be admitted that the number of votes cast was about five times in excess of the actual voting strength of the town; but if it be true that 243 voters only voted 315 times their moderation in time of great local excitement is to be wondered at.

The minister is reported to have said that he "saw one man put in several votes at one time;" but that statement is also very indefinite. Did he count the number of votes so deposited? Is he dead sure that his eyes did not deceive him? If he saw a man do a thing like this, was it not his duty to make complaint against him in regular form instead of warming over the incident for the benefit of his congregation and exposing the community in which he lives, and to which he ministers to the scorn of other communities in which doubtless greater irregularities occurred? The cheating in the Democratic primary at Lumberton was all very bad, of course, and, particularly, because the election was "in the family," so to speak; but if it actually took place, as alleged, it was only the survival of the policy of fraud entered upon deliberately in some of the States in this part of the country many years ago. It was defended at that time because something had to be done to deliver the South from destruction. We claimed then, as we believe now, that there were two courses open—force or fraud. Both were bad; but whereas the former would leave the hands comparatively clean, the latter would result inevitably in the corruption of the whole body politic. By diligent use of the Chicago City Directory the Democrats in one of the counties we have in mind were able to return an enormous majority, but it was at the sacrifice of some self-respect, as might be shown by the aftermath.

We defended it then on the ground of a desperate public necessity, but we do not believe that such a plea would hold in any court of morals. We cannot be crooked with the opposition and invariably straight with ourselves. It is one of the phases of humanity that successful dishonesty towards the State is likely after awhile to become a pernicious habit with the person or community or section that practices it. A case in point is that of former Governor Rollins, of New Hampshire, who attempted recently to swindle the Government out of certain revenues to which it was entitled under the law; the very law, in fact, which this victim of the Government's rapacity had always defended and supported because under its provisions the special industries in which he and the people of his part of the country are interested were able to thrive by the robbery of the general public.

The present subject, however, relates to a condition with which we should be able to deal in the bosom of the family with all the shades pulled down. If we cannot be honest with ourselves, how can we be expected to be honest with the State? One of the objects in the party primaries is to obtain agreement among the members of the household, and they ought to be perfectly straight if they are to be of any value in settling questions relating to both men and measures. "As a rule," says our Charlotte contemporary, "there is more or less laxity about the primaries in each party than at the regular elections, where the rules and regulations are strictly observed." This is a very serious charge, but we have known elections in another State when there was as much sharp practice in party elections as at the general election; really more, in fact, for the party election, in the circumstances, determined the result at the general election. To make the party elections fair and straight ought to be made the subject of the most drastic regulations the law can prescribe.

OUR FIGHT IN CONNECTICUT.

Thanks to our persistence, the Senatorial campaign in Connecticut is warming up nicely. Governor McLean told in an interview the other day, printed in Dr. Clark's paper, about how Bulkeley has assured him and others that he would not be able to spare more than two or three years for Washington, and that it was the nearest thing to his heart that McLean should take his place. Bulkeley used to call him "George," and nothing would do for him but that "George" should promise him that he would run for the office; that he was "getting tired of Washington" and might "retire at any time," and so on to the end of a very interesting chapter. Governor McLean does not hold the old man to his promises, nor does he think himself the best qualified man in Connecticut to fill the office of Senator; but he makes it very clear that Bulkeley ought not to succeed himself. What has he ever done to justify his former election? Where does he stand among the Senators of the country? What has he accomplished in statesmanship?

McLean is an entirely different sort of person. He has good looks, an abundance of common sense, is in the prime of life and is a hard worker. We are told by Dr. Clark that "if the people of the State were called on to name their Senator he would be chosen 'hands down.'" We do not know how that is; we think it not unlikely that if the people of the State had their way they would elect a Democrat. They ought to do the next best thing and elect a Republican like McLean, whom the Democrats could respect.

LUNATICS AND JAILS.

The Executive Committee of the State Conference of Charities and Corrections has done many valuable things since its organization, and the body which it represents has done even more for the Commonwealth. It has pointed out new reforms; it has advocated better jails; it has embodied laws for the better care of destitute children; it has done a hundred things to give it a lasting place in the regard and esteem of our people.

The Executive Committee never did a better thing, however, than to begin an agitation for the care of the insane between the time they are alleged to be lunatic and are sent to the asylum. So far this agitation has not passed beyond the preliminary stages, but its direction is well chosen and its outcome is assured.

Our Virginia laws go upon the unjust and almost barbarous principle that insanity is an offence against the law. A constable or a policeman is the man summoned, instead of a physician or an alienist, when a man is suspected of lunacy. All that follows, in the brutal treatment of the insane, is the result of this fundamental injustice. When a person—say a harmless woman—is thought to be insane, the law requires that she either be committed to jail or bailed by some reputable citizen. Many an unfortunate, innocent of wrong and suffering only from disease, has no friend who will go on her bond. Consequently, she is sent to jail, there to await the verdict of a Commission of Lunacy.

Every one who knows what a Virginia county jail is, knows what such commitment means. The jails, in many instances, are absolutely unfit for human occupancy. They are vermin-infested, unsanitary, hot in summer, frigid in winter; and they are generally so arranged that the innocent mix with the guilty, the unoffending lunatic with the hardened criminal. Many who are not insane, become insane from their surroundings, and many who are later released from prison never recover from their awful experience with hardened offenders against the law.

The Conference wants to remedy this—its plan is exactly the right one. It would have a lunatic cited into Court, if necessary, but it would have a physician or a health officer instructed to place the suspect under quarantine, with a constable in charge. In this way, all but the most violent could be kept amid decent surroundings until their sanity or insanity has been determined.

This reform should be made. Virginia's prestige demands it. We were the first State in the Union to begin the proper care of the insane; we were the first to provide for the care of epileptics; we have always led; we cannot fall behind by permitting our helpless insane to be treated as common felons and subjected to all the horrors of jail life.

STEPPING STONES TO OFFICE.

If we were living in Charleston, we should insist upon the candidates for Mayor defining their positions exactly upon the question of the removal of the stone steps at the Battery. Shall such iconoclasm as this pass without a definitive declaration on the part of those who are seeking the suffrages of the people? Some old fellow has butted into this subject by writing a letter to The News and Courier saying that fifty years or so ago the stone steps were placed at the south side of the sea wall, and not at the western end, the point from which the Princess Louise entered the barge H. M. S. Dido to take passage for England.

So far as we have been able to learn, there was no protest at the time of the removal of the stone steps from the south side of the Battery to the west end, nor have we any means of spotting the present stone steps as the original stone steps; but for the last thirty years at least the steps have been at the west end of the Battery, and nobody ever thought of taking them away until Goodwyn Rhett's head became filled with all sorts of so-called progressive ideas. It may be too late to prevent the destruction of this monument, which is almost entirely covered by water twice a day; but, with Judge Jervey still in active operation, and, if he be absent from the city, with Judge Rouse able to hold up the judicial end of the business, and with Judge Meminger living around in Church Street, we do not see why it is not practicable to have Mayor Rhett ruled for contempt, or mandamused for cause, or permanently enjoined from carrying out his destructive tendencies.

The subject would readily yield to much speculative treatment, but the point upon which we would insist just now is that the candidates for Mayor of Charleston shall declare themselves on the stone steps question. Shall these steps be destroyed? Is there no arm strong enough to protect them? What does Major Hughes say? Where does Colonel Hyde stand? Are they for or against the preservation of this land and water mark? "O, fireman, save my child!"

INSOLENCE IN THE DEPARTMENTS.

Colonel Joseph V. Bidgood, Secretary of Military Records, is not the only man in Virginia who has suffered from insolence in the Federal Departments at Washington. What happened to the Colonel when he sought to get a copy of the muster roll of the Clarke Rifles from the Adjutant-General's office has happened to many another man who has sought in vain for information in the executive offices in Washington.

For some reason, never fully explained, department clerks in Washington have the idea that the offices which they hold are their personal property and that the public records under their charge are always private and confidential. Grave and learned men go to Washington in quest of important information, and are curtly told by the fourth assistant clerk to the second assistant secretary of something or other that the information cannot be obtained. If the visitor is able to escape without insult he is fortunate. Occasionally one meets in the offices of the Government a clerk who is courteous, and one seldom finds the men who really have authority otherwise than gracious and kind; but the underlings, whose office is their greatness, never fail to assert whatever shadow of authority they may have, and always "feel their oats." This, to be sure, is a rule in most business, but it is most inexcusable among those who keep the public records, draw the public pay and are generally where they cannot feel public resentment.

It would be a very good thing if President Taft, who is the soul of urbanity, would send a few of his secret service men around to the various departments and let them test the courtesy of the public servants. Some of the clerks might be badly mauled as a result of the experiment, for the secret service men are a stout company; but the treatment they receive would be a revelation to them and to Mr. Taft. Incidentally, there would be about 10,000 vacant places in the Federal Departments.

THE ANTI-TRUST LAW.

In his speech before the Harvard Law School Association, to which we referred two days ago, Attorney-General Wickersham called attention to the imperative need of finally construing the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. Mr. Wickersham was not the first man to make the discovery that this much-vaunted law is anything but satisfactory, nor was his Harvard speech the first occasion on which he had spoken of the matter, but the disastrous results which have followed the failure of the Court to pass on the law are daily more apparent.

The Sherman law was confusing and equivocal when it was passed. It was too long, too involved, too mechanical; it gave authority to prosecute where it did not provide the machinery; and it made machinery which could not be readily operated. Yet, as the law has remained on the statute books and as it has been construed from year to year, it has become more and more confused, until law officers were forced to rest their cases until the Supreme Court should pass finally on the real meaning of the act.

The classification of holding companies has been the most puzzling and disputed point of the law. Where a company has only a formal existence, and is made up of many smaller companies, stocked and in operation, does the holding company become a monopoly in restraint of trade when its subsidiary companies, taken together, monopolize the trade? The framers of the law did not say, and the judges construing the law in the Northern Securities case, left the deeper question in doubt. When the Supreme Court, in ordering a rehearing of the Tobacco Trust and Oil Trust cases practically admitted that it could reach no decision, the hands of prosecuting officers were tied and the Courts were helpless.

There are about 1,800 holding companies in this country, representing some 40,000 subsidiary companies. Some of these are monopolies; some are merely the conveniences of trade; yet the securities of each and every one of them are of uncertain value until the Court shall decide the case. They are afraid to market new bonds; they dare not issue and sell new stock; they can only wait until new judges on the Supreme Bench will break the deadlock which is supposed to exist, and will put a final and positive construction on the law.

As we pointed out when the Supreme Court refused to pass on the Oil and Tobacco cases, the security of these companies is really the only question involved. Simply to declare that they do not exist legally will have no effect upon their practical existence; for nothing can destroy the property rights, the franchises and the plants upon which the monopoly of the Oil Trust and the alleged monopoly of the Tobacco Trust is said to exist. The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey may be denied the right to sue, and may be declared a fictitious corporation, even an illegal corporation; but the company remains.

The whole discussion, however, at this time, illustrates the failing of our system of trust regulation and points out the remedy. If the final construction of the Anti-Trust Law resolves itself into a classification of holding companies, and if the Courts must decide on this construction, why should not the courts have decided the matter in the first instance. If the Government officers thought that the Standard Oil Company was a monopoly in restraint of trade—which it probably is—why did they have to invoke a law which is doubtful in its meaning and ponderous in its operations? Why did they not sue the company as a conspiracy and decide the matter without the formality of special statutes? Such a method would certainly have saved time and would perhaps have avoided complications which may arise when the Court finally reaches its verdict.

Henry Watterson will not tell us a thing about that Robert Collier dinner he attended in New York about a week ago, and what was said and done. Was Pinchot there? And Glavis and Kerby? What did they talk about, and what did they agree to do? Never mind about the vittles, "Marse Henry," but tell us about the conversation.

It begins to look as if Mr. Pulitzer will not have to pay for that dinner after all.

The Springfield Republican is breaking into the hot wave a bit by discussing the proper use of such words as "shall" and "will." We shall not go into the subject, but we will say that the Republican comes very near hitting them right every time.

The silver-plated bulletin boards of The Times-Dispatch were put up yesterday for the great prize fight next Monday. Choice seats may be obtained in the park across the way or out in Bank Street. If Jeffries's protoplasm hold out and he is not interfered with by his inside fat, it looks as if he would win; but keep your money in your pocket or give it to your wife and children. Then you can take it back.

"Cabot" does not seem to be paying very much attention to Butler Ames, but Cabot ought to know by this time that it is never safe to bet on an election until after it is over and all the ballots have been counted. Over-confidence has lost many a good cause.

It is not "once in a great while," but every day that we have some kind thought of North Carolina and its people; one of the greatest States in the South, and, therefore, one of the greatest States in the Union, and filled with the finest people we have known, except the people of the other Carolina, we must say this much as in duty bound, and the people of Virginia, because it is true. We suppose that Brother Harris, of the Charlotte Evening Chronicle, will give this enthusiastic tribute the benefit of his 40,000 an hour circulation.

It is said that more persons die from dog-bites in South Carolina than from snake-bites. "That is what comes," remarks the Savannah Press, "of not finding a pleasant remedy for dog-bites." Is it not true, rather, that it proves how effective the administration of the prohibition law is in South Carolina?

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

Wording a Deed, Etc.

There is a church and school house in this city that is the property of the Episcopal Church. The church is used, but the school house is not in use for want of repairs. There is a clause in the deed that says if the property ceases to be used for church and school purposes that it shall revert to the coal company giving same. Please tell me if this would hold in the courts and could the giver take this property back? There was a money consideration of $1.00 paid in the transaction. X. X. X.

This will depend upon the wording of the deed, and must be tested in court. Generally speaking, the coal company had a perfect right to make such a stipulation and could enforce it if the deed were properly drawn.

Claret Ice.

Can drug stores in the State of Virginia serve a drink known and called claret ice in towns where whiskey is legally sold? DRUG STORE.

No.

Baseball on the Fourth of July.

Please tell me if there will be a professional game of baseball on July 4 in Richmond. If so, by whom? BASEBALL FAN.

Yes, Danville vs. Richmond. There will be two games, morning and afternoon.

Masons and Odd Fellows.

1. Please tell me the number of Odd Fellows and Masons in the United States.

2. Can a woman join the Rebeccas without some of her kin being an Odd Fellow? W. M.

1. At last reports there were 1,309,697 Free Masons in the United States and 1,441,403 Odd Fellows.

2. You will have to apply to a local lodge for this information.

Day of Week, Etc.

I was born on June 2, 1893. On what day of the week was it? A READER.

Saturday. Your other question has no place in this column.

The University of Michigan.

To whom should I write for information regarding admission to the University of Michigan? READER.

Address Dr. H. B. Hutchins, acting president.

WOULD NOT ACCEPT FAMOUS OLD PALACE

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

WITH regard to the Mme. de Halpert, who is now in London playing the role of fairy godmother to her nephew, Prince Anthony Albert Radziwill, and abetting his projected marriage to Miss Gladys Deacon against the wishes of his mother, she is the latter's sister, and, like her, a daughter of the late Count Branicki, who was one of the leaders of the Polish colony in Paris. Mme. de Halpert enjoys the unusual distinction of having been dame du palais at one and the same time to no less than three women of sovereign rank, namely, of the two Empresses of Russia and of Queen Helen of Italy. While she has retained the former two dignities, she severed her connection with the court of the Quirinal when she secured a judicial separation from her first husband. The latter was Prince Piere Strozzi, head of the Strozzi family of Florence and Rome, and after his death, three years ago, she married Charles de Halpert, who is connected with the Department of Foreign Affairs at St. Petersburg. He is a man considerably younger than herself.

It is the death of her first husband, Prince Strozzi, that has given rise to so much confusion in connection with the disposition of his property, and especially of his magnificent palace at Florence. Overwhelmed with debts, and realizing that neither of his two brothers had male issue, nor yet a fortune adequate for the maintenance of the palace, he bequeathed the latter, along with his family archives, to the state, the archives in particular containing a perfect mine of historical information, and being of priceless value. He made the bequest conditional on the payment of certain charges, namely, the dower rights of his widow, now Mme. de Halpert, and the payment, spread over four years, of $100,000 to his brothers. The entire charges, all told, could not exceed $200,000, that is to say, 1,000,000 francs. He likewise bequeathed all his magnificent collection of paintings, old masters, and family portraits, to the municipality of Florence, stipulating that they should be kept together as a collection, either in the palace itself, by arrangement with the state, or else in some equally suitable building.

Unfortunately, the Italian government did not see its way to accept the bequest of the Strozzi Palace. It has too many historic palaces on its hands as it is, and the cost of their maintenance constitutes a severe drain on the resources of the crown and of the treasury. On the other hand, the municipality, while it has already accepted the bequest of the pictures, does not wish to accept the palace, on the ground that it cannot afford to burden itself with the 1,000,000 of francs in the form of payments to Mme. de Halpert and to Prince Piere's two surviving brothers, nor yet with the obligations to pay off the big mortgages with which the palace is encumbered. Finally, Mme. de Halpert, the widow of the testator, and his two brothers and heirs, absolutely refuse to keep the palace or the archives, on the ground that they were expressly alienated from them by the testator's will, and that they do not wish to render themselves responsible for his debts.

Thus the Strozzi Palace for the time being remains without an owner, since neither the Italian government nor the city of Florence nor the Strozzi family will have anything to do with it. To add to the confusion, the Italian government, although it has received several offers from foreign capitalists, including one, it is said, from J. Pierpont Morgan, does not dare to offend popular sentiment by selling the palace to any foreigner rich enough to buy it.

For the Strozzi Palace has been for the last 500 years one of the most superb and majestic ornaments of the city on the Arno, and a familiar landmark to every one of the many thousands of American tourists who have visited Florence. It is a masterpiece of medieval architecture, and built of such first-class material that it stands to-day as perfect in every detail and as uninjured by the lapse of time as when completed away back in the early part of the fifteenth century. The palace is the work of the architects Benedetto da Majano and of Simone del Pollajuolo, surnamed Il Cronica (the Story Teller), while the Fanali or corner lanterns, the link holders and the rings are among the finest examples of the wonderful skill of the celebrated smith, Nicollo Grosso. The latter was nicknamed by Lorenzo di Medici as the "Caparra" (the Pledge), because he would never give credit to any customer. It was to Niccolo, by the by, that George Eliot sent "Tito," to buy his mail shirt, "the garment of fear."

The Strozzis are one of the oldest houses of the patriciate of Florence, their antiquity being greater, indeed, than that of the city itself; and it is a fact that their name figures as that of a very ancient family, in records of the year 1050 still in existence. One of the Strozzis, as Lord Rector of the University of Florence in 1406, devoted a portion of his vast fortune to the collection in Greece of ancient manuscripts, and it is to him that the world is indebted for the recovery and preservation of the "Lives of Plutarch" and of the works of Plato. Strozzis are to be found on almost every page of Italian, German and French history. Leo Strozzi commanded a fleet of some thirty French ships which sailed for Scotland in a vain attempt to rescue Queen Mary Stuart, a short time before she fell into the hands of her arch enemy, Queen Elizabeth, who sent her to the scaffold. Hercules Strozzi was assassinated on the eve of his marriage by Duke Alfonso I. of Medici, who was in love with his bride. Philip Strozzi was the admiral of the French fleet, who, taken in battle off the Azores by the Spaniards, was made to "walk the plank" and drowned by the Spanish admiral, Santa Cruz.

Peter Strozzi was killed as marshal of France and as generalissimo of the military forces of Pope Paul IV., at the siege of Thienville, while another, Philip Strozzi, perhaps the most famous of them all, lives in history as the greatest adversary of Duke Cosmo of Medici. Imprisoned by the latter, and subjected to the most frightful tortures, he put a sudden end to his sufferings by seizing the sword of one of his guards and by running himself through the body before any one could interfere.

The only members left of the princely branch of the house of Strozzi are the present chief of the family, Prince Leone, Duke of Bagnolo, and a former officer of the French navy. He has a nineteen-year-old daughter and a sixteen-year-old daughter, Beatrice, but no sons. His only brother, Robert, a retired cavalry officer, is a confirmed bachelor, and his sister, Dona Luisa, is married to the statesman and former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Francesco Guicciardini. The Countess Anna Maria Strozzi, who has just arrived in this country from Florence with Mr. and Mrs. John W. Ellsworth, of New York, the purchasers of the Villa Palmieri at Florence, belongs to a different branch of the family, which does not possess the princely title, nor is included in the pages of the Almanach de Gotha.

In view of the many controversies that are in progress in the newspapers, both in this country and in England as to what constitutes an accident, and in what way it differs from a misfortune, it may be timely to recall the amusing explanation given by Napoleon III., in response to an inquiry of his little boy, the ill-fated Prince Imperial, who years later was to meet with death in South Africa at the hands of the Zulus. "My son," he exclaimed, "if your cousin Napoleon" (the surly and cantankerous Plon-Plon) "were to fall into the Seine, it would be an accident; whereas if any one fished him out, it would most assuredly be a malheur"—that is to say, a misfortune.

(Copyright, 1910, by the Brentwood Company.)